9 March 1976

STATINTL   MEMO FOR: Mr. ██████████
                        Mr. McMahon

            SUBJECT :   Responses to Coordination of DD/S&T
                        RD&E Program (DD/A 76-0823, attached)

            The following is a summary of the DD/A responses to
Sayre Stevens' memo of 20 February. The memoranda are
attached.

            Office of Logistics - S&T memo coincides with OL study
to determine where we stand with regard to the state of the
STATINTL   art in ██████████████. OL suggests that this be considered
as a possibility for discussion with Stevens.

            Office of Medical Services - ORD has received OMS' formal
requirements and has coordinated and incorporated them into
their program.

            Office of Joint Computer Support - Most of the procedures
described in Stevens' memo have been in effect for the past
two years and have contributed to improved RD&E coordination.
At the working level, ORD and OJCS have effective coordination
on RD&E projects related to ADP and computer activities.

            Office of Security - No suggestions concerning DD/S&T
RD&E coordination process. Working level exchanges and
Working Group meetings provide OS and ORD with an effective
communications mechanism. Security has not enjoyed the same
degree of exchange with OTS which has proposed that they
become the single conduit through which OS would send its
RD&E requirements to DD/S&T. Given past problems OS has
experienced, they suggest that Mr. McMahon explore the focal
point issue with the A-DD/S&T to determine if this is the
most efficient way of communicating requirements or whether
a more formal conduit such as the Chief, R&D Staff/DDS&T,
would be preferable.

            Office of Communications - Commo acknowledges that their
response may be defensive and "nitpicking" in nature, but
feels that there is a basis for such feelings. They hope for

a clarification of procedures leading to better products, and will do everything they can to maintain good relationships. They call for each Directorate to perform its responsibilities without usurping those belonging to the others. They call for formal paperwork summarizing the results of informal meetings, clarification of the impact of OC comments and suggestions on adjustments to be made to programs and advice by S&T on any reprogramming which affects any DD/A program. OC is rewriting a memo of agreement between OC and OD&E to reflect an organizational transfer of responsibility for Covert Communications RD&E to OTS.

   ISAS - The review milestones associated with the modified budget cycle are an addition to review procedures developed earlier in the 70's. Two items that ISAS feels are worthwhile RD&E efforts are: a computerized system of file records control, and Computer Input Microfilm (CIM - as opposed to the already developed Computer Output Microfilm - COM). A study should be undertaken to examine carefully the potential of the technology against broad Agency requirements and to consider the cost of adapting state-of-the-art equipment to service these needs.

STATINTL

Attachments (8)

3 March 1976

Rewritten
Ause for JAS notes

STATINTL

MEMO FOR: Mr. ▇▇▇▇▇▇
           Mr. McMahon

SUBJECT : Responses to Coordination of DD/S&T
               RD&E Program (DD/A 76-0823, attached)

The following is a summary of the DD/A responses to Sayre Stevens' memo of 20 February. The memoranda are ~~available if you would like to review them~~ *attached.*

Office of Logistics - S&T memo coincides with OL study

STATINTL

to determine where we stand with regard to the state of the art in ▇▇▇▇▇▇▇▇. OL suggests that this be considered as a possibility for discussion with Stevens.

Office of Medical Services - ORD has received OMS' formal requirements and has coordinated and incorporated them into their program.

Office of Joint Computer Support - Most of the procedures described in Stevens' memo have been in effect for the past two years and have contributed to improved RD&E coordination. At the working level, ORD and OJCS have effective coordination on RD&E projects related to ADP and computer activities.

Office of Security - No suggestions concerning DD/S&T RD&E coordination process. Working level exchanges and Working Group meetings provide OS and ORD with an effective communications mechanism. Security has not enjoyed the same degree of exchange with OTS which has proposed that they become the single conduit through which OS would send its RD&E requirements to DD/S&T. Given past problems OS has experienced, they suggest that Mr. McMahon explore the focal point issue with the A-DD/S&T to determine if this is the most efficient way of communicating requirements or whether a more formal conduit such as the Chief, R&D Staff/DDS&T, would be preferable.

Office of Communications - Commo acknowledges that their response may be defensive and "nitpicking" in nature, but feels that there is a basis for such feelings. They hope for a clarification of procedures leading to better products, and

will do everything they can to maintain good relationships.
They call for each Directorate to perform its responsibilities
without usurping those belonging to the others. They call for
formal paperwork summarizing the results of informal meetings,
clarification of the impact of OC comments and suggestions on
adjustments to be made to programs and advice by S&T on any
reprogramming which affects any DD/A program. OC is rewriting
a memo of agreement between OC and OD&E to reflect an organi-
zational transfer of responsibility for Covert Communications
RD&E to OTS.

STATINTL

Att: DD/A 76-0823

STATINTL

John:

① ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ says it will
probably be April before Sayre
convenes the meeting of 400's...

② It does seem to make sense
that I be the coordinator to
interface with ▮▮▮▮▮ particularly   STATINTL
on reprogramming. We will need
an internal DOA procedure on
R&D interface with S&T — not
certainly to get in the way of day
to day DOA - S&T traffic re what
S&T is doing for us — but for
reprogramming. (over)

SPEED LETTER	REPLY REQUESTED				DATE 25 February 1976
		YES		NO	LETTER NO.

TO : JAS	FROM: HAV
ATTN:	

Jim -

Re Program Review: It appears we will get the proposal for DDA blessing in April. I think we will want to have in hand a statement from our offices on each of the items as the basis for concurrence with the proposal and for prioritization. We certainly would want to know, for example, the impact on DDA resources of follow-on action. Will it require more or fewer people? Will it require more funds or will a savings result? Thus it appears we should set up a complementary procedure for "coordination of RD&E Program" within DDA.

Reprogramming: Throughout the sections on Program Review and Budget Review he refers states "We will apprise you . . . any other pertinent reprogramming actions" or words to this effect. It is not until he discusses the current year (para c.) that he alludes to "consultation" with respect to reprogramming. I believe OC's gripe, and justly so, is that reprogramming action is being taken without consultation of the interested people. I suggest that the proposed procedure be revised to recognize the need for consultation at all stages of reprogramming.

SIGNATURE

REPLY	DATE

I'm not sure just how the first few sections of para 2.a. relate with para. 3.
There seems to be a disconnect here.

Helen

SIGNATURE

RETURN TO ORIGINATOR

FORM 5-67 1831 USE PREVIOUS EDITIONS